

balancing the driveshaft for rotation. However, the Examiner fails to note that the specification further states that the use of adhesives for this purpose has not gain widespread acceptance because the curing time for such adhesives is relatively long. As a result, an undesirably long time delay is usually encountered between the initial point in time at which the balance weight is applied to the driveshaft and the subsequent point in time at which the adhesive has cured to allow the driveshaft and balance weight assembly to be re-tested to confirm the achievement of proper balance. This undesirably long time delay prevents the efficient manufacture of the driveshaft tubes in the high volume quantities usually associated with the vehicular manufacturing industry. For these reasons, the known prior art relating to the attachment of balance weights to vehicular driveshafts has been and continues to be deficient. The claimed invention satisfies this long-felt need in the industry.

The Examiner relies upon the Duck et al. reference for the teaching of the use of microwave energy to quickly set a portion of an adhesive 3 provided between a windshield 2 and a vehicle body 1 and to allow the remainder of the adhesive to set later. However, as previously discussed, the Duck et al. reference is not analogous to the claimed invention. Clearly, the Duck et al. reference is not within the field of the applicant's endeavor. Furthermore, the disclosure of the Duck et al. reference is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was involved. The assembly of windshields into vehicle bodies has no rational relationship with the balancing of driveshafts for rotation. The Examiner appears to suggest that the Duck et al. reference is analogous to any invention involving the use of adhesives. However, that interpretation goes well beyond the well known and accepted standards as recited by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Furthermore, the Duck et al. reference fails to show or suggest an important feature of the invention. Specifically, Claim 14 recites that the unbalanced driveshaft and the balance weight are moved toward one another such that a first portion of the adhesive material is disposed between the unbalanced driveshaft and the balance weight at a location for balancing the driveshaft for rotation about an axis and a second portion of the adhesive material extends from between the unbalanced

driveshaft and the balance weight. As clearly shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of the Duck et al. reference, all of the adhesive 3 is completely disposed between the windshield 2 and the vehicle body 1. None of such adhesive 3 extends from between the windshield 2 and the vehicle body 1, as specifically claimed. Thus, even if the Duck et al. reference is analogous art relative to the claimed invention, it does not show or suggest at least this feature thereof.

The Challenger et al. reference suffers from the same deficiencies as the Duck et al. reference. The disclosure of the Challenger et al. reference is clearly not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was involved. The press for performing adhesive bonding of two sheet metal parts has no rational relationship with the balancing of driveshafts for rotation. The Examiner also appears to suggest that the Challenger et al. reference is analogous to any invention involving the use of adhesives. However, that interpretation goes well beyond the well known and accepted standards as recited by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Furthermore, the Challenger et al. reference fails to show or suggest that the unbalanced driveshaft and the balance weight are moved toward one another such that a first portion of the adhesive material is disposed between the unbalanced driveshaft and the balance weight at a location for balancing the driveshaft for rotation about an axis and a second portion of the adhesive material extends from between the unbalanced driveshaft and the balance weight. As best shown in Fig. 1 of the Challenger et al. reference, all of the adhesive 15 appears to be completely disposed between the two parts 14 and 16. None of such adhesive 15 appears to extend from between the two parts 14 and 16, as specifically claimed. Thus, even if the Challenger et al. reference is analogous art relative to the claimed invention, it does not show or suggest at least this feature thereof.

In view of the amendments and above remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice Of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard S. MacMillan
Reg. No. 30,085

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900